[8th August 1929

12-45 p.m. Mr. G. Harisarvottama Rao demanded a poll, and the House divided thus:

Ayes.

1. Mr. P. C. Venkatapathi Raju.
2. ,, K. Koti Reddi.
3. ,, R. Srinivasa Ayyangar.
4. ,, S. Satyamurti.
5. ,, C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar.
6. ,, J. A. Saldanha.
7. ,, G. Harisarvottama Rao.
8. ,, C. S. Govindaraja Mudaliyar.
9. ,, Abdul Hameed Khan.
10. ,, K. V. R. Swami.
11. ,, D. Narayana Raju.
12. ,, K. R. Karant.
13. ,, K. Madhavan Nayar.
14. ,, P. Anjaneyulu.
15. ,, A. Parasarama Rao.
16. ,, C. Ramasomayajulu.
17. ,, T. Adinarayana Chettiyar.
18. ,, Ahmed Miran Sahib.
19. ,, K. Uppi Sahib.
20. ,, M. Narayana Rao.
21. ,, C. Marudavanam Pillai.
22. ,, K. V. Krishnaswami Nayakar.
23. ,, C. Venkatarangam Nayudu.
24. ,, B. Venkataratnam.
25. Rao Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabapathi Mudaliyar.
26. Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar.
27. Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar.
28. Mr. Ramanath Goenka.
29. ,, K. P. Raman Menon.
30. ,, R. Nagan Gowda.
31. ,, C. R. Parthasarathi Ayyangar.
32. ,, T. C. Srinivasa Ayyangar.
33. ,, Chavadi K. Subrahmanya Pillai.
34. ,, C. Gopala Menon.
35. ,, B. Ramachandra Reddi.
36. Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. Patro.
37. Diwan Bahadur P. C. Ethirajulu Nayudu.
38. Mr. P. T. Rajan.
39. ,, Kadir Mohideen Sahib.
40. Diwan Bahadur S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar.
41. Khan Sahib T. M. Moidoo Sahib Bahadur.
42. Rao Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu.
43. ,, K. Sitarama Reddiyar.
44. Mr. Abdul Razaack Sahib.

Noes.

1. The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur.
2. ,, Sir Thomas Moir.
3. ,, Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar.
4. ,, Mr. A. Y. G. Campbell.
5. ,, ,, M. R. Seturatnam Ayyar.
6. ,, ,, S. Muthiah Mudaliyar.
7. ,, Dr. P. Subbarayan.
8. Mr. Hilton Brown.
9. ,, H. A. Watson.
10. ,, A. G. Leach.
11. ,, J. Gray.
12. ,, S. V. Ramamurti.
13. ,, C. B. Cotterell.
14. ,, V. Ch. John.
15. ,, M. A. Manikkavelu Nayakar.
16. ,, Syed Tajudin Sahib.
17. ,, J. Bheemayya.
18. ,, R. Foulkes.
19. ,, P. J. Gnanavaram Pillai.
20. The Muppil Nayar of Kavalappara.
21. The Zamindar of Singampatti.
22. Mr. J. Kuppuswami.
23. Subadar-Major S. A. Nanjappah Bahadur.
24. Mr. K. Krishnan.
25. ,, N. Siva Raj.
26. ,, M. V. Gangadhara Siva.
27. ,, V. I. Muniswami Pillai.
28. ,, W. P. A. Soundara Pandian.
29. ,, S. Subrahmanya Moopanar.
30. ,, Daniel Thomas.
31. ,, S. Venkiah.
32. Rao Sahib R. Srinivasan.
33. Mr. Mahmud Schamnad.
34. Khan Bahadur P. Khalif-ul-lah Sahib Bahadur.
35. Mr. G. Premayya.
36. ,, U. Ramaswami Ayyar.
37. ,, S. N. Dorai Raja.
38. ,, S. Arpudaswami Udayar.
39. The Raja of Kallikote.
40. Mr. A. J. Leech.

Ayes 44. *Noes* 40.

The resolution was carried.

TRIFURCATION OF THE RAJAHMUNDRY TALUK BOARD.

Mr. B. VENKATARATNAM moved—

'*This Council recommends to the Government that the present Rajahmundry Taluk Board be trifurcated into Amalapuram, Razole and Rajahmundry Taluk Boards contiguous with the Revenue taluks.*'

In doing so, he made a speech in Telugu and commended the resolution to the House.

8th August 1929]

Diwan Bahadur P. C. ETHIRAJULU NAYUDU :—" Madam, I second this resolution. In doing so, many words are not needed from me to convince the House of the need for trifurcation of the Rajahmundry Taluk Board. The hon. Mover has already referred to the real grievances of the people in regard to this matter. I therefore trust the Council will accept the resolution and pass it."

Mr. B. RAMACHANDRA REDDI :—" Madam, I move my amendment, and that is

'*To substitute the word "conterminous" for the word "contiguous" in line 3.*'

" It is only to explain the meaning of this resolution more clearly that I want to substitute the word 'conterminous' for the word 'contiguous' in the resolution. It is not at all necessary for me to make a long speech on this amendment. If this amendment is accepted, it will put the resolution in a more explanatory form, and I hope the House will agree to it."

Mr. Chavadi K. SUBRAHMANYA PILLAI :—" I second it."

Mr. B. Venkataratnam accepted the amendment in Telugu. The amendment was put and carried.

The hon. the DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Dr. MUTHULAKSHMI REDDI) :—" The amended resolution is now before the House for discussion."

Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI :—" Madam, this question of trifurcation was started in 1918, and, in that year, the Government asked the several local boards that in case that a particular local board felt that the work it had to do was heavy the same was to be reported to the Government. Accordingly, the Rajahmundry Taluk Board reported to the Government that the work that had to be performed by that board was too heavy because it had to manage three taluks, namely, Rajahmundry, Amalapur and Razole, and recommended that the board might be divided into three boards, each of these taluks being constituted into a board. That recommendation was accepted by the district board also. In the year 1920, the Government passed an order on that, approving of the recommendation made both by the taluk board and the district board. It is true that there were some contradictory recommendations both from the taluk board and the district board. The Rajahmundry Taluk Board said that the Rajahmundry and Razole taluks should be formed into one board, Amalapur taluk forming a separate board altogether. Again, there was another proposal, which emanated from the district board, to the effect that Amalapur and Razole should be formed into one board and Rajahmundry into a separate board. Whatever that might be, finally the taluk board said that the Rajahmundry Board should be trifurcated. This was accepted by the Government, and they passed orders thereon in 1920. Unfortunately, thereafter, this subject had a chequered life. In 1921, about the 14th of March, a special wire was sent to the Rajahmundry Taluk Board by the Government, which said, 'Proposals, trifurcation of the Rajahmundry Taluk Board, should be deferred till new Local Boards Act comes into force.' That was the purport of the telegram sent by Government. Had it not been for that wire, the taluk board would have been trifurcated on the 1st April 1921, and it was on account of that wire, the trifurcation was deferred. Then, in 1922, the Rajahmundry Taluk Board itself, which was a board newly formed under the new Act of 1920, passed a resolution that they did

[Mr. K. V. R. Swami] [8th August 1929

not want any trifurcation at all. Thereafter, in 1923, that proposal was accepted by the Government, for reasons which were best known to the Government, in spite of the approval of the Government to the previous proposal of the taluk board for trifurcation. However, the resolution which was passed by the taluk board formed under the Act of 1920 was accepted by the Government in 1923. The reason why this new board adopted this particular resolution was this: in 1922 and 1923, the Nationalist party boycotted the Legislative Council as well as the local bodies, and they did not take any part in local board administration, and this new Rajahmundry Taluk Board was formed by one particular community, and they thought that their own interests overweighed the interests of the taluk board, and that in their interest it would be better to have the Rajahmundry Taluk 1 p.m. Board kept as it was and that it should not be separated. That is really a wrong view, because as stated by my hon. Friend Mr. Venkataratnam, it is a huge body of three taluks combined into one board. This Government a decade ago accepted the principle that other circumstances being equal each taluk should have a separate board. Though it was accepted in principle, somehow or other this matter was delayed. After that, again in 1923, the Rajahmundry Taluk Board passed a resolution that that board should be divided into three boards, viz., Rajahmundry, Amalapuram and Razole. The Rajahmundry Taluk Board and the district board, and the people also convened several meetings and stated as their settled opinion that there should be three boards, and that it would be impossible for any president to manage all the three taluks, the areas being too big with many elementary schools, sanitary and water works and other things. The feeling was very keen and they insisted on having separate taluk boards. Under those circumstances, I hope that the hon. the Chief Minister would accept this resolution because it is a policy once accepted by the Government but delayed for particular reasons that were prevailing at that time. But now, I do not think that any such reasons would stand in the way of the hon. the Minister accepting this resolution. With these words I commend this resolution to the acceptance of the House."

* Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—" Deputy President, Madam, I rise to give my whole-hearted support to this motion lest it might be said that members coming from the southern districts are either lukewarm or indifferent so far as this resolution is concerned. All along I have been of opinion that the area of taluk boards should be small so as to ensure efficiency and proper administration. On many an occasion I brought this to the notice of the Government and tried to get the heavy taluk boards reduced to their proper and reasonable dimension, but without success. Humanly speaking, it is not possible for one individual who is in charge of three taluks to discharge the duties to the satisfaction of all concerned.

"In my district, the Tirukkoyilur Taluk Board passed a resolution in favour of bifurcating it and the same was accepted by the district board unanimously. And when I brought this matter to the attention of the Government and requested it to give effect to it, the Government replied that as the question of retaining or abolishing the taluk board was under consideration nothing could be done in the direction suggested by me. The motion to bifurcate the Tindivanam Taluk Board was lost by only one vote, as many as 15 voting for it and 16 against it. That really showed the intensity of the feeling in the matter and a desire on the part of the people to have a

8th August 1929] [Mr. R. Srinivasa Ayyangar]

smaller compact board which will satisfy them all. And when I brought this to the notice of the Government supported by facts and figures, it contented itself with the old reply that pending the disposal of the question of the retention or abolition of the taluk board nothing could be done. I am glad to be able to know that the policy of the present Government is to reduce the area of the taluk boards as much as possible to ensure efficiency, and it is high time that the Government tackles this question in a right spirit and sets about bifurcating the boards wherever necessary throughout the Presidency. If this resolution is carried, as I hope it will, I would not have the slightest doubt that similar bifurcations may take place in respect of other taluk boards. And I am somewhat keen about Tirukkoyilur and Tindivanam Taluk Boards which on account of the unwieldy area and the heavy strain of work require immediate bifurcation. It is in that spirit I give my support to this resolution, and I do hope that the hon. the Chief Minister will, without further delay, inaugurate a new policy, so far as the area of the taluk boards is concerned."

* Mr. B. Ramachandra Reddi :—" In support of this resolution I wish to convey to this House and the hon. Minister in charge of this portfolio a few facts which have an important bearing on this question. It has been twice decided by the district board and the taluk board concerned to have this particular taluk board trifurcated, and I do not know what reasons have prompted the Government to keep the whole thing in abeyance. In 1920, a Government Order was issued asking the district and taluk boards to fix a date for the dissolution of that particular board. Accordingly both the taluk board of Rajahmundry and the district board passed resolutions fixing the date, even giving more time to the Government to think about this question by requesting them to give effect to their intention in 1922 if not in 1921. Ever since this question was raised, as many as thirteen taluk boards in the Presidency have been bifurcated and trifurcated wherever necessary, and even in this particular district, namely, the East Godavari, two taluk boards have already been bifurcated. And it is really unthinkable why this particular taluk board, which is a vast and unwieldy one, has not been thought of for being trifurcated. It has an area of nearly 1,050 square miles and a length of 75 miles. The means of communication are either very slow or inadequate. It gets a revenue under general accounts of Rs. 1,18,000 and the receipts under elementary education come to Rs. 2,45,000. There are about 1,200 teachers working under this board, and about 400 schools are being run. With these facts and figures I wish to urge upon this Government the necessity for immediate trifurcation of this particular taluk board. It is really a non-party question and my enquiry in that district shows that men of all shades of opinion and all parties are anxious to see that the taluk board is trifurcated. It was not at all surprising for me to hear that at one stage the residents of this particular taluk board even thought of non-payment of taxes pending this trifurcation. In these circumstances, I urge on the hon. the Minister the necessity for trifurcating this particular taluk board in the interests of better administration."

* Mr. C. Ramasomayajulu :—" Madam, in connexion with this resolution I wish to place a few facts and figures before the House with reference to the constitution of the taluk board. The Rajahmundry taluk consists of three important advanced taluks, viz., Rajahmundry, Amalapuram and Razole. Two of them are totally deltaic taluks and the third is partially

deltaic. They are cultured and advanced taluks, and they cover a long distance, the largest being 75 miles, with an area of 1,000 square miles. They administer nearly 400 schools and 1,000 teachers are under their control. Further, this vast jurisdiction has been for long under one revenue divisional officer. This revenue division was thought too much for one revenue officer and recently the Government published a Government Order to the effect that this division was going to be split up into two. If for purposes of revenue administration it was thought too big, it was but natural that for local boards purposes it was felt too heavy. That was why it was resolved upon to bifurcate it so long ago as 1920. It has not been given effect to. Ever since 1925 onwards, both the taluk board and the East Godavari District Board have been passing unanimous resolutions pressing this question on the attention of the Government, and the Government up to now have not heeded to their request. Remarks have been made incessantly about the large extent of the area under its jurisdiction, which are found in the administration reports, district and taluk reports, and yet the Government have not given any attention to the matter. The taluk board at present deals with a budget of Rs. 4,61,000 a year. The taluk board and the East Godavari District Board have unanimously recommended the trifurcation. I cannot see why the Government is playing hide and seek in regard to this important matter. It is up to the Government at least now to put into force this resolution without any more shilly-shallying."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—" Madam President, I am glad to hear from Mr. Ramachandra Reddi that this question was supported by him in a non-party spirit. May I appeal to the hon. the Minister that when he comes to dispose of this question finally he will deal with it similarly in a non-party manner ? My apprehension was not altogether without foundation, if I may say so, speaking from my past experience. I know, for example, that the presidents of a district board and the taluk board under it were not getting on well, and the president of the district board wanted the trifurcation of the taluk board in order to get rid of the taluk board president. Madam, questions of this sort are likely to crop up hereafter. For instance, the South Arcot District Board or the Chingleput District Board may come up with proposals for the bifurcation of the taluks under it. We do not know how many more may come up hereafter. I wish that the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government will deal with such proposals when they come before him, in a strictly constitutional and non-party manner. And I do not think there can be a better method of dealing with them than by immediately throwing open the newly constituted boards for election. After all, there is nothing compelling the Government to have recourse to nomination in reconstituting these boards. My hon. Friend the Minister must be sufficiently tired of the troubles in the matter of making nominations, and I wish that at least at this fag-end of his tenure of office he would have the goodness not to entangle himself further into them but give the freedom to the people to elect their own presidents. I only want this assurance from him, for, personally, I am for each taluk to be constituted into a board so that people may take an active interest and deal with their own affairs more profitably and effectively than is the case at present."

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—" Madam, I think the history of this question has been gone into by Mr. Ramachandra Reddi and Mr. Swami, as far back as 1920. The latest proposal about trifurcation was made in

8th August 1929] [Dr. P. Subbarayan]

1924. At that time, the hon. Minister in charge thought that trifurcation was not necessary but bifurcation would be beneficial and recommended that bifurcation might be resorted to. But the district board and the taluk 1-15 board turned down these proposals although I think they were eminently p.m. reasonable, because Rajahmundry and Razole and Amalapur could easily become two taluk boards easy of management. If people were so keen on having a division of the taluk board, I think it was up to the district board and the taluk board to have then accepted the proposal of the then hon. Minister in charge of Local Self-Government. Since then there has been a proposal for trifurcation but the district board president was not in favour of the proposal and we have not been able to get from him schemes for the division of the financial liabilities of this board without which it has not been possible to accept the resolution of my hon. Friend. Those schemes have now come and we hope to give effect to the trifurcation at the beginning of the next financial year, i.e., April. If the proposal is to be given effect to now it would be very difficult to calculate the assets as they stand. So I think my hon. Friend, Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar, need not be under the impression that I am going to use it for party purposes. After all, trifurcation is going to be effected only in April next. What might happen between now and April next we do not know. The future is in the lap of Gods. When such is the case, there is no room for any apprehension on the part of Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar. It may even be that he himself may have to effect this trifurcation. But then I hope that he will bear in mind the dictum he laid down for me.

"As regards the question whether election or nomination should be resorted to, I think it is difficult to lay down any principles, because there are places where elections are difficult to hold. Perhaps my hon. Friend, Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar, was referring to Bellary when he talked of some president wanting to have a board bifurcated. I do not think that happened in our time, because my hon. Friend was also in the Government at that time and I do not remember any reference to Bellary in these matters. Evidently he refers to something that happened before. I am not aware of this proposal. But I can tell my hon. Friend that, as far as possible, it will be my duty to see that no party is helped and that all elected members who are on the board are nominated to the trifurcated taluk board when trifurcation takes place. With these words, Madam Deputy President, I will accept the resolution of my hon. Friend, Mr. B. Venkataratnam."

Mr. B. VENKATARATNAM :—(Spoke in Telugu).

The resolution as amended was put and carried.

The House then adjourned for lunch.

After Lunch (2-30 p.m.)

APPOINTMENT OF HIGHLY QUALIFIED WOMEN ON THE PUBLIC HEALTH STAFF.

* Dr. (Mrs.) S. MUTHULAKSHMI REDDI :—" Mr. President, Sir, I beg to move that

'*This Council recommends to the Government that highly qualified medical women should be appointed on the Public Health Staff to*